

Quality Assurance To be completed by Project Staff NOT involved in implementation

| Coordinator: | Session: | Date of Review: |
|--|---|-----------------|
| 1. Appropriate rapport/engagement. (weakness) 1 2 3 4 Comments: | , , | |
| 2. Preparation for the meeting. (weakness) 1 2 3 4 Comments: | , , , | |
| 3. Presentation Style: a. Was the coordinator comfortal (weakness) 1 2 3 b. Did the coordinator display ad | 4 5 (strength) equate knowledge of the mat | erial? |
| (weakness) 1 2 Comments: | 3 4 5 (strength | |
| 4. Encouraged questions and comments (weakness) 1 2 3 4 Comments: | 5 (strength) | |



| 5. | Provided relevant feedback or answers to questions to participants. (weakness) 1 2 3 4 5 (strength) |
|-----|---|
| Co | mments: |
| | |
| 6. | Was the information documented for participants (i.e., handouts were given)? (weakness) 1 2 3 4 5 (strength) N/A |
| Co | mments: |
| 7. | Did participants verbalize an understanding of the information or skill learned? (weakness) 1 2 3 4 5 (strength) |
| _ | |
| Co | mments: |
| | |
| 8. | Components of the intervention were appropriately covered. |
| | (weakness) 1 2 3 4 5 (strength) |
| Co | mments: |
| | |
| | |
| 9. | Overall effectiveness of the coordinator in teaching the session: (weakness) 1 2 3 4 5 (strength) |
| Co | mments: |
| | |
| | |
| Ov | erall feedback: |
| | |
| | |
| Sig | nature of Investigator/PM-Date |